REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on September 11, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended, and claims 15-20 are added; as a result, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mashayekhi et al. (U.S.5,818,936) in view of Viavant et al.(U.S. 5,784,566). It is fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection each and every element or step of the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the cited references.

Here, neither reference in isolation nor in combination teach or suggest providing an "authentication secret" to a client node as is recited in Applicant's amended and newly added independent claims 1, 9, and 15. Moreover, neither reference in isolation nor in combination teach or suggest a "session key" or a dual key that also includes a "common key" in the manners recited and positively claimed in Applicant's amended independent claims 1 and 9 and Applicant's newly added independent claim 15.

More specifically, Mashayekhi is directed towards an automated authentication service that automates an authentication exchange between a user and an application over a network. Mashayekhi attempts to limit exchanges of keys and information over a network and specifically states that its teachings are designed to reduce this need which will thereby improve bandwidth and not compromise security by exposing these keys unnecessarily over the network lines. *E.g.*, Mashayekhi, col. 5, lines 22-33).

As a result, Mashayekhi does not send application secrets to a user's machine (*e.g.*, client). The secrets are maintained by an API that does not reside on and is not directly accessible to the user. *E.g.*, Mashayekhi, Fig. 2, node 210; and col. 5, lines 34-40. The authentication configuration of Mashayekhi provides a separate node and API that is accessible to a user's machine defined in Fig. 1 as 102a-102n. The server node (Fig. 1 104a-104n) is configured and expanded as shown in Fig. 2. Moreover, the entire specification and teaching of Mashayekhi comports with this arrangement. Thus, the secrets in Mashayekhi are not provided

to the user's machine. The user authenticates during an initial login and the secrets reside and are maintained on the server nodes which are not part of the user's machine. Conversely, Applicant's amended and newly added independent claims recite an authentication secret that is specifically provided to the client. The client uses this secret to directly (and not indirectly as required by the Mashayekhi teachings) authenticate to the desired network resource.

Additionally, Viavant cannot be used to modify the teachings of Mashayekhi in order to provide this teaching, because to do so would defeat the purpose and teachings of Mashayekhi. That is, the whole point of the Mashayekhi teaching is to avoid sending secrets over the network, which may be compromised and which consume excessive bandwidth during network transactions.

Therefore, the rejections should be withdrawn, because Mashayekhi fails to teach sending secrets to a client as is recited in Applicant's independent claims, and because Viavant cannot be used to modify Mashayekhi in order to achieve the same because to do so defeats and runs contrary to the teachings of Mashayekhi. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn along with an indication that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Applicant's independent claims concisely recite a session key that is novel over the references cited by the Examiner. Applicant's session key is needed to first decrypt the common key, the common key is needed to decrypt the authentication secret. Thus, Applicant's independent claims require a unique arrangement and use of dual keys before any authentication secret can be acquired. It is not common and it is not taught or suggested in Mashayekhi or Viavant a key arrangement and key usage as is positively recited in Applicant's independent claims. There is no teaching of double encryption that uses double keys as is recited in Applicant's independent claims.

Thus, Applicant also respectfully submits that Applicant's independent claims teach and positively recite a specific type of session key that is not taught or suggested in the references cited. This teaching of the Applicant's independent claims can not be found in any single reference standing alone or in any proposed combination of the references. Thus, Applicant's submit the rejections should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((513) 942-0224) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743

Respectfully submitted,

CAMERON MASHAYEKHI

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date 12-11-03

By Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 11th day of December, 2003.

Amy Moriarty
Name

Signature